UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

Vs.

Vs.

NIRAV B. PATEL,

Defendant.

)

Cause No.

3:23-cr-30076-SPM-1

East St. Louis, IL

January 14, 2025

9:44 a.m.

Before the HONORABLE JUDGE STEPHEN P. MCGYLNN

TRANSCRIPT OF FINAL PRETRIAL CONFERENCE

FOR PLAINTIFF: Mr. Peter T. Reed

Mr. Steven D. Weinhoeft

United States Attorney's Office

9 Executive Drive

Fairview Heights, Illinois 62208

peter.reed@usdoj.gov

steven.weinhoeft@usdoj.gov

FOR DEFENDANT: Ms. Kim C. Freter

Federal Public Defender's Office 650 Missouri Avenue, Suite G10A East St. Louis, Illinois 62201

kim freter@fd.org

INTERPRETER: Nita Shah

COURT REPORTER: Erin M. Materkowski, RPR, CRR

erin materkowski@ilsd.uscourts.gov

750 Missouri Avenue

East St. Louis, IL 62201

(Proceedings taken by machine shorthand; transcript produced by computer-aided transcription)

(In open court.)

2.1

2.3

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Court calls Case No. 3:23-cr-30076, the *United States of America v.*Nirav Patel. Case is called for a final pretrial hearing.

Parties, if you would please introduce yourselves for the record.

MR. REED: Good morning, Judge. Peter Reed and Steve Weinhoeft for the Government.

THE COURT: Good morning, gentlemen.

MS. FRETER: Good morning, Your Honor.

Kim Freter for Mr. Patel, and I apologize, Judge.

I was so certain this was on Thursday. I have a

visit even set up with Mr. Patel for this

afternoon. I just apologize.

THE COURT: It happens. I'm not worried about it.

Good morning, Mr. Patel.

All right. We have several Motions in limine filed by the Government. The last one being filed yesterday seeking to present the deposition testimony of Sergeant Towell, T-o-w-e-l-l, to the jury during trial as he is out of the area or even out of the country on National Guard duty. Any objection?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MS. FRETER: No, Your Honor. There was one objection in the course of the deposition that the Government and I were working to resolve, and I think we've got that --MR. REED: The hearsay objection, I think that maybe you're standing on. Is that accurate? MS. FRETER: Yes. MR. REED: Okay. There is one objection I thought we had as well; but if you're willing to rule on it today, then we can cut the video, and we won't have to skip back and forth during the course. MS. FRETER: I have no objection to the deposition being admitted. MR. REED: It's up to you, Your Honor. I have the transcript. THE COURT: Why don't you just give me the I'll take a look at it. Let me know transcript. what page it is, and we can take it up before we bring the jury in next week. MR. REED: Okay. MS. FRETER: Thank you, Your Honor. COURTROOM DEPUTY: The interpreter needs to be sworn.

THE COURT: I'm sorry?

COURTROOM DEPUTY: I need to swear in the interpreter.

THE COURT: Oh, okay.

2.3

We have to swear in the interpreter, so ma'am.

(Interpreter Nita Shah sworn.)

THE INTERPRETER: I do.

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Does the defense have any motions in limine?

MS. FRETER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I did receive a letter dated January the 8th from the Consulate General of India. Actually, the letter was addressed to the United States Attorney and was forwarded to our office.

The letter reads, in part: As part of our consular responsibilities, the Consulate General of India in Chicago spoke to Mr. Patel through an online video call arranged by the Alton Police Department. During the interaction, Mr. Patel expressed dissatisfaction with his current defense attorney and conveyed a request for assistance in securing alternate -- or alternative legal representation. He claims to have raised this

matter with the presiding judge.

2.1

2.3

Counsel, is there a -- have you been informed by anyone, any other attorney, that he or she is going to be entering an appearance on behalf of Mr. Patel in this case?

MS. FRETER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Are you under the impression that Mr. Patel is seeking to have you removed as his counsel in this case?

MS. FRETER: My understanding, Judge, is that we're in the same place that we've been before, that he's unhappy with the choices that I've presented to him but that he does not want a continuance of his trial and that he understands if he gets a new trial, the trial -- or new lawyer, the trial will get pushed back, and so it's the same couple of conversations we've had before.

THE COURT: All right. The Court has appointed an attorney to assist Mr. Patel. The Court has appointed the Chief Federal Public Defender for the Southern District of Illinois. She was selected by the district judges of Southern Illinois after a thorough merit selection process, and she was selected because of her demonstrated ability as both a defense lawyer and as someone

2.1

2.3

with the Court the judges felt comfortable would do the best job recruiting and mentoring and helping other assistant federal public defenders that would be in the office. I've seen nothing in this case or any other case that suggests that there would be reason to be concerned about the quality of the representation of the defendant in this case. The defendant -- defendant's counsel -- are you death penalty certified?

MS. FRETER: Yes, I am. I'm learned counsel.

THE COURT: And, in fact, you had a death penalty case before me -- or a death penalty eligible case before me, and she is also defense counsel in RICO litigation and major conspiracy cases.

And I have not filed any -- I have not forwarded any response to this letter from the Consulate General of India.

Has the Government done anything with respect to this letter?

MR. REED: Judge, we have not sent a response to the Consulate in regard to this letter. We are consulting with our Office of IA, which is the Office of International Affairs, to make sure

there is nothing we need to do.

2.1

THE COURT: Well, I will direct that a transcript of this part of the proceeding in which I've addressed this letter on the record be forwarded to Mr. Gautam, G-a-u-t-a-m, who is Head of Chancery and the Consul, Consulate General of India.

Any objection?

MR. REED: No objection, Judge.

MS. FRETER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. We are set to start trial Tuesday; is that correct?

MR. REED: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Is the Government going to be ready?

MR. REED: Yes, Judge.

MS. FRETER: We're ready, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And how long do you anticipate it taking?

MR. REED: Judge, I still think we should be done by the end of next week, by Friday. Some of that is going to depend on timing with the interpreter in court, but I feel confident we should be able to finish up by the end of the week.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

night.

MS. FRETER: I think that's right, Judge. We've worked out some stipulations. We're hopeful to work out some more, so I think we're able to cut out a couple witnesses. THE COURT: How many prospective jurors do you think we need to bring in? MR. REED: What's a typical? THE COURT: Forty, 45. MS. FRETER: How many did you have, Peter, a couple weeks ago? MR. REED: I think we pulled in 55 because of the length. MS. FRETER: How close did you get? MR. REED: I think we had 15 left. I think 40, 45 should be fine. THE COURT: Yeah, when you think of those issues that might provoke a strong response from potential jurors like a child victim. Now, the victims in this case were elderly. I think if we bring in 45, 46 jurors, we should be okay. MS. FRETER: I just haven't looked at the weather for next week. THE COURT: I have only looked at the

Notre Dame-Ohio State game that's going on Monday

(Off the record.)

2.1

THE COURT: Let's plan on trying to start -- let's get the lawyers here by 9, and there's always things to take up beforehand. We'll plan to try to get the jury pool up here around 10.

How soon will they have the packets for the lawyers to review? Jackie, what is the normal turnaround?

COURTROOM DEPUTY: We have another trial that day with Judge Dugan, so it may be a little later than normal, but they try to have them up by 9, 9:30.

So Mr. Patel, what happens is we send questionnaires to each of the prospective jurors, and it gives us background information about them. So they'll bring up a binder that has the answers to all the questions that the jurors filled out, and we'll give that to your attorney; and I'll give her time to go through it and review their answers to see if there's anything that points out a concern. So it probably won't be until probably quarter after 10, twenty after 10 until we start questioning potential jurors; but hopefully, we can get the jury picked and opening statements commencing early afternoon.

2.1

And do you know what witnesses you're going to lead with?

MR. REED: Yes, Judge. We are planning to have two witnesses here. I know when we had two jury venires here in December, jury selection ended up taking all day. I'm hoping that's not the case, but we will have witnesses ready to go.

THE COURT: You think jury selection will take all day?

MR. REED: I raise it simply because it surprised us in December when they brought in two venires for two trials at the same time. Juror selection in both cases, we only got through openings. I raise it -- it took a long time. Hopefully, that doesn't happen again next week; but if it does take all day, then that may back us up as we're going through the week.

MS. FRETER: I was in trial with Judge
Dugan at the same time that Mr. Reed was in trial
with Chief Judge Rosenstengel, and there was about
a hundred jurors. Judge Dugan, I think, had asked
for more than he usually did, too, because of the
nature of that case.

MR. REED: Right.

MS. FRETER: And it slowed down things in

2.1

the jury assembly room, I think, some, and it was just a weird day.

MR. REED: It was a weird day.

MS. FRETER: I think, because we're asking for fewer jurors, and I don't know what kind of case Judge Dugan has --

MR. WEINHOEFT: Gun case.

MR. REED: It's a gun case.

MS. FRETER: So he won't need as many either. I think that it will go faster. I don't usually ever ask -- 40 minutes would be my max. Usually it's closer to 15 or 20. I just don't ask that -- between the questionnaires and what's already done before me, I go pretty fast, and I -- as soon as they bring those binders, I can stand -- I mean, I work while they talk, so --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. REED: I'm hopeful we'll be able to get through witnesses on Tuesday as well. I just flag it because that happened and I think it surprised us all.

THE COURT: Well, if it takes all day, I'll just blame it on the fact that there's two jury trials and not a hangover.

MR. WEINHOEFT: Judge, may I ask, what is

2.1

your custom and practice for -- do you normally do panels? How do you handle back striking, things like that?

THE COURT: So I will ask questions, basic questions. I'll take them -- I'll address questions to those who are in the jury box, then I'll address questions to those that are in the gallery on the left side and then questions to those in the gallery on the right side.

When we ultimately go to pick the jury, I pick in groups of three. I don't allow back striking. The Government will have to tender three jurors to the defense, and the defense will have to tender back three jurors; and once we agree on the first three jurors, then we start the process again with the next three until we get to twelve and two alternates.

If you have any questions, if there's any issues you want me to ask the jury about, that you prefer I be the one to ask the question, I always contemplate doing those. There are some areas that have to be delved into in certain cases that are very uncomfortable for potential jurors, and I'd rather them take it out on me as opposed to one of the lawyers.

2.1

MR. WEINHOEFT: We appreciate that.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Patel has his hand up. Do you want to talk to --

MS. FRETER: Mr. Patel, you need to sit down.

THE DEFENDANT: I would like the people of this Nation to know what kind of things are going on here, and I insist on the media here before the proceedings.

THE COURT: Insist on the media what?

MS. FRETER: Judge, he wants the press here. I've explained to Mr. Patel, this is an open courtroom. The press is able to come if they so choose. He's, I guess, asking that I or you invite the press. I don't do that, and so I will not do that, but if the press -- Mr. Patel, you have to sit down.

If the press want to appear, they're, of course, more than welcome to as it's an open courtroom.

THE COURT: In the federal system,

Mr. Patel, the Court is open to the public including the media; however, the media is not allowed to broadcast the live proceedings without specific permission from the trial judge.

Is anyone going to be requesting daily transcripts in this case?

MR. REED: No, Judge.

2.3

MS. FRETER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Erin, our court reporter, is taking down every word, and so there will be a written transcript of the entire proceedings that can be made available to the media if the media wishes.

From time to time, there are things in the transcript that I order be sealed. Meaning, we have a formal record of it, but that part of the record is not available to the public to review. Sometimes there are things of a sensitive nature that come up in a case where I order that that portion of the trial be sealed to protect a defendant or a witness or a victim from the disclosure of sensitive information.

Now, Mr. Patel, before we start the trial, I will address you in detail about your rights. I'm not -- you have a lawyer, so you don't need me to give you legal advice, but I will tell you that you are -- you are going to begin an experience that's going to be the first time you have been through anything like this; however, your lawyer is

2.1

incredibly well trained and has a tremendous amount of experience defending individuals such as yourself in a criminal case. Ultimately, it will be your decision to make as to whether or not you testify. If you choose to testify, we will put you on the stand, and you'll be able to answer questions and tell the jurors your side of the story. You do not have to testify, and you cannot be compelled to testify, and you should discuss that with your attorney. It's a very important part of the trial strategy in trying to defend your interests.

If you stand up and start talking to the jury, you may waive your Fifth Amendment rights; and if you start talking to the jury, I may have to allow the Government attorneys to put you on the stand and answer questions about what you just said. I don't want that to happen. In our proceedings so far, I have allowed you at times to address me directly without going through your attorney; but when the jury is in the courtroom, I'm going to have to enforce the rules that your attorney is the one who speaks for you unless and until you take the stand. All right?

It's obvious that this is a very stressful

2.1

situation for you and that you're very worried about how this is all going to play out, and I understand that; but we are -- I'm really going to enforce the rules. You are lucky you have the attorney you have, and I mean that. So don't get upset or get mad if I prevent you from speaking out at a time when you feel the need, or urgency, to announce in Court whatever is on your mind.

All right. Anything else we need to take up for the Government?

MR. REED: Nothing else, Judge. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: I will fight my case myself.

THE COURT: You seem like a nice guy, but
I'm telling you that would be really foolish. I
have -- I've been a lawyer since 1987. If I was in
a foreign country, and I was on trial and the
entire trial was conducted in a language I didn't
understand, there's not a chance I would defend
myself, and I established myself as a very good
trial lawyer when I was in private practice.

Now, if you defend yourself, you have to follow the rules, and you don't get to testify as

2.1

to facts unless you're put under oath. You can testify, but then you have to stand for cross-examination.

Counsel, do you have a concern about your client's competence; or what do you think is going on other than the fact that he's presented several options, and none of the options he's presented is the one he wants?

MS. FRETER: Judge, Mr. Patel was present at the videotaped deposition that we did to preserve testimony, and we had an interpreter who was able to simultaneously interpret for him. At the end of the deposition, he was trying to talk to both the officer and to the Government, and he -- from that conversation, so I'm not revealing attorney-client, he sees this case very differently.

The officer testified in a manner that the Government believes is inculpatory, that shows Mr. Patel is guilty of this offense, and the Government feels that that's very good testimony for them. Mr. Patel, who was present for the same testimony, feels that it is exculpatory, that the officer's testimony and what happened shows that he is not guilty of this crime or crimes. Those views

2.1

are diametrically opposed, and Mr. Patel just sees the case one way and the Government sees it another way, and the twain may never meet.

And so it's my opinion that I've told
Mr. Patel about testifying, we worked on that, that
that is at the end of the case. He's indicated to
me -- and this isn't a surprise to the
Government -- he intends to testify at this point.
He wants to get up and tell his side of the story.
I think that based on his totality of his
situation, I don't know that he can pass a Faretta
examination to be able to represent himself. I
don't think that he's able to perform in this
courtroom as -- as a pro se defendant. I think
that Mr. Patel's concerns may be alleviated after
he's testified, after he's able to, sort of, tell
the jury his side of the story.

THE COURT: Can he read and understand the English language?

MS. FRETER: Not really, Judge, no.

THE COURT: All right. So any exhibits that are in a written form, he is not going to be able to read them and properly understand them; is that correct?

MS. FRETER: Yes, Your Honor. And the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

sort of fundamental basics of our legal system in terms of that there's rules, who goes first, who goes second, that -- that litigants aren't just able to talk to the court or explain their side such as the case just goes away, he's not able to -- I'm sure the Court has had folks who are sovereign citizens, and they don't believe in the Government, but this is different than that. is not even the understanding, sort of, that you would have from watching TV shows about courtrooms. He's just not able to really -- as the Court said, this is an experience very different from him that he had before. The basics of it, he's just not able to appreciate at this time. Maybe after trial, he'll understand more. He understands witnesses are going to come in and testify, there is going to be a jury, and they're going to get to decide, and he is going to get to say his side of the story, and he's seen a portion of that because we did the videotaped deposition, but I think that he feels that if he just is able to tell the Government that he didn't do this that the case will just go away.

THE COURT: The Government is well aware,
Mr. Patel, that you maintain very strongly that you

2.1

are innocent. I presume you are innocent, and that presumption stays with you until the Government can prove to the satisfaction of the jury that you're guilty beyond a reasonable doubt of one or more of these charges that you face.

Do we need to have a hearing on his competency to represent himself?

MS. FRETER: Again, Judge, Mr. Patel just sees the case very, very differently than the Government does. I don't know -- so the case I just had with Judge Dugan that I was stand-by counsel, the defendant was pro se. It was his second pro se trial. He was well familiar with the rules of procedure, objections, hearsay, could ask questions, also could maintain courtroom decorum. He was able to, after both the judge's admonition and inquiry, represent himself. Was it a wise decision, probably not, but he was able to exist within the courtroom space.

It's my opinion Mr. Patel is not going to be able to do that. He wants questions asked of the witnesses that are just inadmissible, that he's not going to be able to formulate any type of court-like examination or pick a jury or do any of those things that a pro se defendant would be able

to do.

2.1

2.3

THE COURT: Do you anticipate calling any witnesses other than the defendant?

MS. FRETER: I don't. Judge, this case is really -- it comes down to one issue only about knowledge and intent, and the only person who is able to demonstrate that is Mr. Patel, and the jury is either going to believe him about his knowledge and intent or they're not.

I'm able to construct a scaffolding with all of these little parts from all these other witnesses to show that he lacked knowledge and lacked intent. The Government will try to knock that down; but ultimately, it just comes down to what -- when he gets up there and testifies, do they believe him or not.

I'm in a better position, quite frankly, to put him in a place where they can relate his testimony to the facts based on this scaffolding that I'll construct than he is. He is not going to be able to respond to the Government's objections. It's not a -- it's just my opinion. I don't think that it's -- it's not a lack of competency in terms of intellectual functioning or mental health. I don't think he has either of those issues, and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

we've spent quite a lot of time together. I just think that he feels very strongly and he's very inflexible in his thinking, and it is very contrary to how the Government feels about the same facts.

THE COURT: All right. I will question the defendant on Monday to see if it's appropriate to allow him to proceed representing himself with you as stand-by counsel.

Mr. Patel, in our system people have a right to an attorney. They also have the right to represent themselves. When someone is charged with crimes such as you and are facing potential penalties, that give -- I have to give serious consideration to whether or not a particular individual has the capacity to mount a credible defense against these charges. So defending yourself would mean that would you make an opening statement. Defending yourself would mean that you would raise the objections, any objections, to questions posed by the Government to witnesses, any objections to evidence that the Government seeks to present and respond to any objections that the Government lodges against your presentation or witnesses or evidence you wish to produce, and this happens in realtime.

2.1

So you will be trying to do this in a language you don't speak, and you would be trying to respond to objections voiced in a language you don't speak, and you would have to follow rules that you've not read, and then you would have to have a translator try to explain the rules to you in realtime.

As a practical matter, before you would testify, the jurors very well may form opinions about you that may not help you, and the best presentation of your case may be to have your lawyer craft questions to you that would allow you to tell your story, and at times you've been very moving in your statement, or statements, about that you're not guilty, that you didn't understand what was going on.

I presided over a number of cases in which individuals have elected to represent themselves instead of allow the lawyer to do his or her job. You're presumed innocent, and you -- a jury may find that you are innocent, but this is a serious process, and your best chance of this jury concluding that the Government has not proved its case against you, that bad things happened but it wasn't your fault, your best chance of securing a

2.1

verdict in your favor is by having your lawyer take the lead in handling this case.

Does the Government have a position on this?

MR. REED: Judge, I'd say two things.

First, with regards to Faretta, there seems to be some significant obstacles to this request, and I think the second thing that I would say, it's not clear that there is a request to represent himself; and having a couple days for him to think about it and discuss with Ms. Freter and take it up first thing Tuesday morning would make sense to determine whether or not that is, in fact, what he's requesting and have full knowledge with that.

THE COURT: Ms. Freter?

MS. FRETER: I have a meeting with

Mr. Patel and an interpreter set up this afternoon
at four o'clock, and then I think we're supposed to
meet again Thursday or Friday. It's my habit
usually, after each witness is toward the end of
testifying, and I check in with my clients, and I
say is there anything else you want me to ask? I
don't always ask those questions, but I check in.
I think that may help to alleviate Mr. Patel's
concerns that I'm not going to do what it is that

he wants.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

I think that waiting until Tuesday to talk to him about if he's making a request to truly represent himself is probably a good idea. think, also, we could continue to check in with him throughout the course of the trial in case he changes his mind, but I think that my recollection of Faretta is one of the standards is, you know, whether the Court feels that a defendant is going to be able to conform to the rules of court and conform to the sort of decorum area. If Mr. Patel is not able to restrain himself and not speak out of turn and not do those kind of things, you know, the Court can always have him removed which sometimes happens. I'm hopeful that we don't get to that point, but that's part of the sort of Faretta rubric; so hopefully, between now and Tuesday Mr. Patel and I can continue to work through these issues.

THE COURT: You should prepare yourself to be lead counsel. There are -- Mr. Patel, I've been a judge a number of years. I've seen people make foolish mistakes, I've seen them make foolish decisions, and sometimes I can't save them from those, and the consequences oftentimes are

2.1

significant. And if I, as a trained lawyer, an experienced trial lawyer, an experienced judge, wouldn't undertake to represent myself in a trial in a foreign country, in a foreign language I don't speak, with written documents I can't read, with rules of court that I had a history of not following, then I don't know how you would fair any better; and my fear is, is that my honest assessment is that the presentation of the evidence to the jury would be nowhere near as good if you represented yourself than it would be if you allowed your trained and experienced lawyer to fight for you.

On several occasions, contrary to your lawyer's objections, you have stood up and you've addressed me, you've become very emotional, you speak fast, your interpreter is probably not picking up on every word you're saying because you speak so fast. Your interpreter will be at a disadvantage to accurately convey the words you have spoken, translating to English, and then tell the jury; and I just think that's going to be a very big problem for you.

When you tell your version of events to the jury, because you will be responding to

2.1

questions presented to you by your lawyer, it will have -- it will have a logical flow to it; and because that's question-answer, question-answer, it helps break up things so that your interpreter is able to keep up with the presentation to the jury. It will flow that much better, and that's a very real -- that's a very real consideration you have to seriously contemplate.

It's not just that you think you're positive you're innocent. It's that that message has to be effectively -- effectively conveyed to the jury, and you don't get a do-over if you lose. If you represent yourself and you lose and you're sentenced to years in jail, you don't get to come back to this court and say, you know what, I know realize I should have let the lawyer help me. I want -- I want a new trial where I have a good lawyer defending me. It's too late.

All right. Anything else for the Government?

MR. REED: Nothing else, Judge.

MS. FRETER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Tuesday morning, let's try to get here by 9:15, and we'll take up whatever else we need to take up. I'm going to

grant the -- all the motions in limine that the Government has filed, and we will take up -- get me the information on the objection in the deposition, and I will let you know my ruling on that before we commence picking a jury, and we'll re-explore this issue about defense -- self-defense.

All right. We're adjourned.

(Proceedings adjourned at 10:42 a.m.)

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER

I, Erin M. Materkowski, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript from reported proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

/s/ Erin M. Materkowski Date: 6/20/2025 ERIN M. MATERKOWSKI, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter

Southern District of Illinois

East St. Louis Division

2.1